AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

One (1) sheet of replacement drawings in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84 is submitted

herewith. The submitted drawings are formal drawings intended to replace the drawings

previously submitted on March 4, 2004. No new matter is added. The Examiner is respectfully

requested to acknowledge receipt of these drawings.

Attachment: One Replacement Sheet 9/9 - (Fig. 9)

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 have been examined. Claims 1-6, 8-10 and 12-17 have been rejected on prior art grounds. The Examiner has indicated that claims 7 and 11 contain allowable subject matter. By this Amendment, Applicant has canceled claims 1 and 12 without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, upon entry of the present Amendment, claims 2-11 and 13-17 will be all the claims pending in the application.

I.   Formal Matters

Applicant thanks the Examiner for initialing and returning the PTO SB/08 Forms submitted with the Information Disclosure Statements of March 4, 2004 and February 1, 2006, indicating that the documents cited therein have been considered. Applicant also thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the foreign priority claim and receipt of the priority document.

II.   Drawing Objection

The Examiner has objected to the drawings filed March 4, 2004, because Figure 9 allegedly should be designated by a legend such as "Prior Art." Applicant is submitting herewith one sheet of replacement drawings incorporating the amendment suggested by the Examiner. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the drawing objection.

III.   Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 2 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for allegedly failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as his invention. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the claim recitation "the job" in claims 2

and 13 lacks antecedent basis. Applicant has amended claims 2 and 13 in a manner believed to

overcome the rejection. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw

the rejection.

IV.   Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Japanese Patent JP 2001-243091 to Motoyama Tetsuro ("Tetsuro") in view of U.S. Patent Appln. Publ. 2004/0156064 to Owen et al. ("Owen")

The Examiner states that claims 1-6, 7-10 and 12-17 have been rejected under 35

U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Tetsuro in view of Owen. However, since

the Examiner has indicated that claim 7 contains allowable subject matter and has not provided

any analysis with regard to claim 7, Applicant presumes that the claim 7 does not stand rejected.

Since claims 1 and 12 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, Applicant submits

that the rejection of such claims is now moot. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

A.   Claim 2

Claim 2 recites, *inter alia*,

> wherein said log storage control module stores a log
> relating to a job into said log storage module on completion of the
> whole job when a next job transmission timing does not come
> before completion of the job, while dividing a job into multiple
> sections and storing a log relating to the divided job into said log
> storage module on completion of every one divisional section of
> the job when the next job transmission timing comes before
> completion of the whole job.

The Examiner concedes that Tetsuro fails to teach the feature "while dividing a job into

multiple sections and storing a log relating to the divided job into said log storage module on

completion of every one divisional section of the job when the next job transmission timing

comes before completion of the whole job." However, the Examiner maintains that Owen cures

the deficient teaching of Tetsuro. The Examiner contends that Owen teaches dividing a job into

different sets, and updating the print log every time a page is finished. *See* Office Action at page

5. However, Owen merely teaches a printing system in which a plurality of print engines are

provided and a controller assigns printing of each page of one print job to one of the plurality of

print engines. *See* Owen at Abstract. After printing, a plurality of sets printed by the respective

print engines are gathered to complete printed pages of one whole job. *See* Owen at paragraph

[0043], lines 1-7.

The log transmission device described in claim 2 is distinct from the device taught by

Owen at least because it varies the timing of storing a log depending on whether or not a next job

transmission timing comes before the whole job is completed. The Examiner cites paragraph

[0043] of Owen as allegedly teaching this feature. However, Owen fails to teach anything

regarding the manner in which the print log is updated. Paragraph [0043] of Owen merely

teaches that the specific pages of each printed copy are logged for the specific set corresponding

to the outputs of the print engines. *See* Owen at paragraph [0043], lines 22-25. However, Owen

fails to specify when the specific pages are logged.

As shown in Figure 4B of Owen, the print log is arranged first by copy, then by set,

followed by the specific pages in each set. For example, SET 1 of copy C1 contains page 1 and

page 5, which is followed by SET 2 containing pages 2, 3 and 7. According to Owen, the

individual pages are assigned to a specific set based upon which print engine is available at the time. *See* Owen at paragraph [0033]. In other words, it is not known beforehand which print engine will print a specific page. Therefore, it would be impossible to log the sets and their corresponding pages after page 1 has been printed because it is not yet known which print engine will be available to print the subsequent pages of the print job. That is, Owen suggests that updating the log must wait until the whole job is complete before updating the log with specific pages that correspond to a specific set.

Even assuming *arguendo* that Owen teaches storing the specific pages after each page is printed, Owen fails to teach dividing the job into multiple sections "when the next job transmission timing comes before completion of the whole job." In other words, Owen automatically divides the print job among various print engines, regardless of whether the next job transmission timing comes before completion of the whole print job. *See* Owen at paragraph [0033].

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 2 is patentable over Tetsuro and Owen for at least the foregoing reasons.

B.   Claims 3-11 and 13-17

Since claims 3-11 are dependent upon claim 2, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable over Tetsuro and Owen at least by virtue of their dependency. Since claim 13 recites features similar to those discussed above in conjunction with claim 2, Applicant submits that claim 13 is patentable over Tetsuro and Owen for at least similar reasons. Lastly, since claims

14-17 are dependent upon claim 13, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable over

Tetsuro and Owen at least by virtue of their dependency.

V.   Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7 and 11 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim,

but would be allowable if rewritten in independent for including all of the limitations of the base

claim and any intervening claims.

VI.   Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kelly G. Hyndman 39,234/
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC   Kelly G. Hyndman
Telephone: (202) 293-7060   Registration No. 39,234
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 19, 2008